

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

**The Examiner's suggestions**

The Examiner's suggestions are greatly appreciated. The Examiner's early indication of allowable subject matter (in accordance with MPEP § 707.07(j)(III)) is also appreciated.

Examiner Michael Fuelling should be commended for taking the initiative to carry out the compact prosecution goals of the Office by offering mutually acceptable claim language early in prosecution. The Examiner's examining style should be used as a model for all USPTO examiners.

**Claim status**

Claims 1 and 31-77 are pending.

Claims 1, 52, and 57-59 were objected to.

Claims 70 and 73-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 31-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim 1 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 13 of U.S. Patent 6,711,460.

Claim 46 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 14 of U.S. Patent 6,711,460.

**The claim objections****Claim 1**

The term "item" has been inserted as requested.

The language "by be" has been corrected to read "to be".

Claim 52

The term "further" has been inserted as requested.

Claim 57

The language "at least one" has been inserted as requested.

Claim 58

The language "at least one" has been inserted as requested.

Claim 59

The term "prescription" has been inserted as requested.

The separate objection (on Action page 2) is unclear because claim 59 does not depend from claim 37 (which has "customer terminal"). Thus, claim 59 has "customer terminal".

Other claims

Similar changes have been made to claims 62-64. Other claims have been modified to correct typographical errors, grammatical errors, improve claim readability, etc.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections

Claim 70 has been modified in a manner similar to the suggestion.

The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, the claims have been modified as suggested. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejections should be withdrawn.

The double patenting rejections

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, in order to advance prosecution a terminal disclaimer is filed herewith with regard to U.S. Patent 6,711,460. Acceptance thereof is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke      Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000